



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

distinguished place among the nations because she has become strong in a militaristic sense. There is nothing in the present condition of world politics to warrant her in believing that militarism is dead. The nations talk of disarmament, but keep on building battleships and submarines. Putting half the American fleet in the Pacific waters has not convinced Japan that it is time for her to reduce armaments. We gather the impression that even among the liberal element in Japan there is no disposition to reduce armaments. Their chief grievance is simply that the military party dominates the civil.

Militarism in England shows no sign of ill health. We are told that the militarists are already beginning to discuss "the next war," as if they were disappointed in the last five years and anxious to see more devastation and to smell more blood. They are saying that the methods employed by the armed forces during the World War have been experiments only. They urge that the war departments must get busy at once and improve upon their experiments, inventing new and more deadly machines. We read that Major General Sir Louis Jackson, officer in charge of offensive gas production and the "Director of Trench Warfare" in the late war, has recently ridiculed the idea that "we have witnessed the last great war." He expressed nothing but contempt for those who desired a reduction of armaments, defending the use of poison gas in warfare, saying that there is no more reason for forbidding the use of gas than for forbidding the use of rifles. Calling attention to the contribution which chemistry, aviation, and commercial machinery must make to the success of the next war, he expressed the view that Germany made a mistake in using explosive instead of incendiary bombs.

Now is the time to "play the game fair." Let us not forget our passionate appeals for support of the war in behalf of a "just and lasting peace," a "war to end war," and to "end militarism." We were not deceiving ourselves then; let us not deceive ourselves now. Let the small group of professional militarists believe in the "next war," if they prefer so to believe. If enough of us talk about another war—bigger, bloodier, and more destructive than the last—and keep at it, we shall certainly get it. And, furthermore, if we continue our propaganda in behalf of a governed world by simply criticising militarism we shall get nowhere. The movement for the peace of the world is big enough to include the militarists; and when that movement has succeeded, as has the prohibition movement in America, then the militarist will just naturally become absorbed as has the bartender in our midst. If the militarists, in the meantime, have any desire to "play the game fair" let them meet the rest of us half way, own up to the hideousness of militaristic philosophy and assist through the society of nations at the death and burial of the foul thing.

AS TO HATING THE GERMANS

THE war having been brought officially to an end Saturday, January 10, and the world now being safe for democracy, we may be pardoned for raising the question, How long does our Christian duty require that we shall continue to hate every German? Since it was a Frenchman, Rochefoucauld, who said, "When our hatred is violent, it sinks us even below those we hate," we shall not be misunderstood if we quote it and repeat our question. Dr. Johnson's fondness for "a good hater" probably had a saturation point. No doubt had he been living during these piping times his appetite would have had more than enough to feed on. Leading writers in England tell us that the English soldier had no hatred for the German soldier as such. Mr. Galsworthy finds the prime sources of hatred for Germans to be in the old men's clubs of London. One hears little of hatred among our doughboys for the individual German. Back in July, 1916, Maurice Maeterlinck wrote: "Question the men returning from the trenches: they detest the enemy; they abhor the aggressor, the unjust and arrogant aggressor, uncouth, too often cruel and treacherous; but they do not hate the man: they do him justice; they pity him; and, after the battle, in the defenseless wounded soldier or disarmed prisoner they recognize, with astonishment, a brother in misfortune who, like themselves, is submitting to duties and laws which, like themselves, he, too, believes lofty and necessary." So our inquiry is, When can we begin to talk less of hatred and somewhat of friendship? When can we begin to get the smell of blood out of our nostrils?

There are scattering evidences that the Christian note is beginning to be sounded here and there. One of our correspondents writes: "I have felt for a long time that we must try to make friends with German youth or there would be danger that they would grow up without faith in God or man, and would thus become a menace to the world." A Quaker American woman now in Berlin writes that the boys and girls there are "starving for friendship as well as for food." Miss Mary N. Chase, Secretary of our New Hampshire Society, having arranged that Christmas cards be sent to a number of German boys and girls, is beginning to receive replies. She says that she has received already over thirty letters from Germany, "all interesting and revealing a fine spirit." The first letter which she received was written in English by a girl eighteen years of age. The letter follows:

BAD BRÜCKMAN (RHÖN),
SINNTHALHOF, November 3, 1919.

DEAR MADAM:

Our school thanks you for your letter. We all are willingly ready to form a comrade-like intercourse with

the boys and girls of your schools, just in this time, when so much hostile sentiment is shown against our country. We, the youth, will help to prepare for the whole world a way for a new, better spirit, a spirit of liberty and fellowship. We believe the correspondence with the youth of other countries to be a good beginning for this, and that much good will come from it. Every one of us would be glad of getting a Christmas card.

Our school has changed its dwelling place; we live for the next time in Brückman (Rhön). Soon it will be decided where we will settle to found our work. Now our school consists of four teachers, one of them for the instruction of music, and six pupils. We strive for a school in which the children of all classes are accepted, and we combat the wrong belief, scientific work to have more value than that of the body. The foster of the spirit of the culture shall be brought in a good word with that of the handicraft and the agriculture. And the free and comrade-like spirit between the teachers and children on one side and the pupils one with another on the other will always inflame to independent and self-productive work.

Please, will you be kind enough to give me a particular report of your school? We are interested of knowing whether your pupils think as we. If, however, this should not be the case, it would not prevent of course, after so long a time of hate and murder, from bringing the idea of humanity nearer to its aim!

With the kindest regards to you and your school.
Die Brückman Freie Schul-und Werkgemeinschaft.

(Signed)

Y. A. LILLY CARSTENS.

From our own correspondence we gather evidences out of Germany of a rational human Christian touch even there. We have received from the *German League of Nations Union* a beautiful illustrated calendar, each page of which breathes the spirit of the great peace-loving and creative Goethe, Kant, Schiller, Herder, Lessing, every quotation being a silent plea to us that we recall the great humanizing things that the world has received out of central Europe.

In the *Vossische Zeitung* a recent editorial contains these words: "It is not the written word, but the creative deed, which can remove the traces of physical and spiritual damage caused by the war. For Germany the first duty is to honor her pledged word." It is not necessary to be intimately acquainted with the German people to realize that among those seventy millions there are still, as before the war, right-minded people, regretful for the crimes of the Hohenzollern dynasty, disillusioned, responsive to that touch of nature which makes the whole world kin.

Dr. Hans Wehberg, writing in *Berliner Tageblatt*, takes the denunciatory references by Mr. Clemenceau, Nicholas Murray Butler and others to the manifesto of the ninety-three German intellectuals of the date of October 11, 1914, as his text and shows that he has been to some pains to find out the present attitude of mind

among that learned group in the light of the present world situation. Of the original number he finds that fifteen have died, one of whom some time before his death withdrew his signature to the document. Of the remaining 78 who are living, 23 have given no answer to Dr. Wehberg's inquiry. Some of these the author finds are ill and unable to reply. Of the 55 who sent answers, 16 are of the same opinion still; but 39 of the original signers have varying explanations for their signatures, ranging from a statement that they misunderstood the purport of the document, some of them not having seen it, to an out-and-out regret that they signed it at all. Eight have withdrawn their signatures because of Dr. Wehberg's letter.

One wonders as one witnesses these attempts on the part of German scholars to get in touch again with the intellectual men of other nations how long it will be before the spirit that became brotherhood between the North and South after our Civil War shall become operative between the people of Germany and those of her one-time enemy nation.

The Germans are our conquered foes. Some of them may talk of revenge. Some may, like certain Southern brave boys after Appomattox, deny that they have been beaten. They may view themselves with self-pity and curse the rest of the world. But the fact is that the proud German military machine is crushed, and, as a people, the Germans are at the mercy of their victors. After knocking him out, Carpentier picked Beckett up in his arms and carried him to his corner. Ordinary sporting spirit calls for a generous magnanimity, even in the prize ring.

But the prize ring of the war is no longer a prize ring. Civilization and humanity in us call again, quite as they did to Lincoln and Grant fifty years ago. When Grant knew that he had Lee's army within his grasp, realizing the nature of the man in the White House and interpreting truly the spirit of the people back home, he spontaneously wrote an order in which he unconsciously enunciated a policy which all subsequent history has approved. He said, "Each officer and man will be allowed to return to his home, not to be disturbed by United States authority so long as they observe their paroles and the laws in force where they reside." The leader of the Union army saw in his imagination those Southern soldier boys returning home to their little farms, to a destitute country, a land all but laid waste by the ruthless hand of war. He thought and felt toward them as only a hero could. Grant's magnanimity made a profound impression upon the Southern army, and General Lee assured him that the entire South "would respond to the clemency he had displayed." Later, when the daughter of General Lee was danger-

ously ill, Grant extended Lee's parole that he might leave Lexington, Virginia, for the bedside of his child. It was in recognition of this generous act, and in what proved to be the last communication between the two great generals, that General Lee expressed his obligation to "the General Commanding the Armies of the United States for his kind consideration." Writing from Raleigh, North Carolina, to his wife, under date of April 25, 1865, and pointing out that the people were anxious to see peace restored, "so that further devastation need not take place in the country," Grant said: "The suffering that must exist in the South the next year, even if the war ended now, will be beyond conception. People who talk of further retaliation and punishment, except of the political leaders, either do not conceive of the suffering endured already or they are heartless and unfeeling and wish to stay at home out of danger while the punishment is being inflicted." One familiar with General Grant's magnanimous attitude toward the South, his fearless opposition to the vindictive feeling of President Johnson toward that stricken land, can easily understand how Mrs. Jefferson Davis could write to him in May, 1866, and say, "All know you ever as good as well as great, merciful as well as brave."

But there is something more pertinent to our inquiry, and nearer at hand. When, on April 2, 1917, President Wilson, speaking at a joint session of the two houses of Congress, recommended the "declaration of a state of war between the United States and the German Imperial Government," he saw fit to say: "We have no quarrel with the German people. We have no feeling toward them but one of sympathy and friendship. It was not upon their impulse that their government acted in entering this war. It was not with their previous knowledge or approval. It was a war determined upon as wars used to be determined upon in the old, unhappy days, when peoples were nowhere consulted by their rulers and wars were provoked and waged in the interest of dynasties or of little groups of ambitious men, who were accustomed to use their fellow-men as pawns and tools." So far as we know, our President has never repudiated these sentiments. In the light of them, we ask again, When will it be proper for the American people to recall the sentiment of that other, and we are sure we may say greater, interpreter of the American spirit, who gave to us the immortal phrase, "with malice toward none"?

When can we call attention again to the fact that there can be no international peace until all the nations, including the Central Powers, accept a common point of view and join willingly in that one legitimate struggle of struggles, the conflict of man against the common enemies of man?

THE WORLD PEACE MOVEMENT

THE world peace movement, which before the war had attained unto proportions which challenged the militarists the world over as they had never been challenged before, a movement which indeed had goaded the warriors into exhibitions of infuriated self assertion as their only means of self preservation, is seen coming out of the war tempered and vindicated. All its followers are buckling on their armors of righteousness again and preparing for another onslaught upon the iniquitous system of war, a system which after a trial of five frightful years stands before the bar of humanity in all its ghastliness and guilt. The mood of the world is changing; has changed. In both hemispheres there is endless disillusionment. Writers everywhere are pleading for the abolition of war. Followers of Mr. Wilson's carelessly conceived League of Nations accept that plan anxiously with the hope that it may be the means of ending war. Any brave gesture, even by willful and incompetent hands such as gave to us the proposed League of Nations, the League to Enforce Peace, a Holy Alliance, would naturally in the present temper of the world secure a large following. As after the wars ending in 1815, the world was sick of the whole beastly business, so again the world demands some means of preventing such outbursts of international insanity, and the average man doesn't care much what they are, if only they are aimed at the overthrow of war.

Out of the blur of counsel, men are finding again the pearls in the peace movement which they thought had been swallowed up in war. Writers like Frank H. Simonds realize that "indemnities" and "securities" set up under the terms of the treaty at Versailles can never indemnify or secure without a peace of real reconciliation. Undefeated Germanism, especially outside Germany, a Russia outside the society of nations, liberated Poland, Czecho-Slovakia, Jugo-Slavia, Rumania, Italian acquisitions, irredentia in Greece, Asia, Africa, and in the islands everywhere all present situations demanding a new birth of that rational good-will which characterizes the center of the peace movement.

"Sanitary cordons" and Prinkipo proposals cannot make the world safe for democracy, or democracy safe for the world. The chief breeder of war is that group of aggressive ideals, traditions, and ambitions, which for the want of a better word we call militarism. The chief breeder of peace is that group of rational ideals, traditions, and ambitions which for the want of a better name we call justice; and justice, the goal of liberty under the rule of law, is the essence of the peace movement.

Anarchy and disorder have had their day; the time of law and order is returning. The peace movement is